

Quantum Group Gauge Theory on Classical Spaces

Tomasz Brzeziński^{*} & Shahn Majid[†]

Department of Applied Mathematics & Theoretical Physics
University of Cambridge, CB3 9EW, U.K.

August 1992

ABSTRACT We study the quantum group gauge theory developed elsewhere in the limit when the base space (spacetime) is a classical space rather than a general quantum space. We show that this limit of the theory for gauge quantum group $U_q(g)$ is isomorphic to usual gauge theory with Lie algebra g . Thus a new kind of gauge theory is not obtained in this way, although we do find some differences in the coupling to matter. Our analysis also illuminates certain inconsistencies in previous work on this topic where a different conclusion had been reached. In particular, we show that the use of the quantum trace in defining a Yang-Mills action in this setting as claimed in [14][9] is not appropriate.

1. Recently a number of physicists have tried to develop a q -analogue or quantum-group gauge theory in which the gauge fields have values in $U_q(g)$ but spacetime is an ordinary manifold [2][14][9], [8]. Here we want to clarify some of the difficulties that arise in this context in the light of our own general quantum group gauge theory developed in [3]. In our work both the gauge group and spacetime were allowed to be quantum spaces and non-trivial examples constructed. We now study the limit of this theory in the case when the base space becomes a usual classical one and show that the resulting gauge theory in this case is necessarily isomorphic to usual gauge theory at least at the level of the gauge fields. There can nevertheless be some subtle differences when the coupling to matter fields is considered. We then contrast our result with some of the above-mentioned previous literature, concentrating on [14][9]. We show that the

^{*}Supported by St. John's College, Cambridge & KBN grant 2 0218 91 01

[†]SERC Fellow and Drapers Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge

Yang-Mills action proposed in these papers (via the quantum trace) is not fully gauge-invariant. We also point out that a reasonable interpretation of some of the formulae in [14] is not possible unless the base space is given by the quantum group itself, which is unfortunately not appropriate when the base is classical as assumed. The paper concludes with a discussion of the status of the matter fields in our theory.

In our theory [3] the role of gauge group is played by a quantum group function algebra A and base space by the (quantum) algebra of functions B on spacetime. A has a standard Hopf algebra structure [1] [12] given by the comultiplication Δ , counit ϵ , and the antipode S . For trivial bundles, a gauge field is a map $\beta : A \rightarrow \Omega^1(B)$, such that $\beta(1) = 0$, where $\Omega^1(B)$ is the space of differential one-forms on B . A gauge transformation is a *convolution-invertible* map $\gamma : A \rightarrow B$ such that $\gamma(1_A) = 1_B$. Here, if $\gamma, \gamma' : A \rightarrow B$ are two linear maps then their convolution product is given as another map $\gamma * \gamma' : A \rightarrow B$ by

$$\gamma * \gamma' = \cdot_B(\gamma \otimes \gamma')\Delta \quad (1)$$

where $\cdot_B$ is the product in B . This defines the convolution algebra of maps, with identity provided by the counit $\epsilon : A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ viewed as a map $A \rightarrow B$ by composing with 1_B . We require our gauge transformations to be invertible elements in this convolution algebra. This technical invertibility requirement will have important consequences in what follows.

Next, the fields on which our covariant derivative acts are linear maps $\sigma : V \rightarrow B$, $\sigma(1_V) = 1_B$ where V is a quantum algebra of functions on a vector space (for example, the quantum plane) on which A coacts i.e. V is a space equipped with a corepresentation $\rho : V \rightarrow A \otimes V$. This is such that $(id \otimes \rho)\rho = (\Delta \otimes id)\rho$ and $(\epsilon \otimes id)\rho = id$. Moreover we assume that ρ is an algebra homomorphism. In this case we can extend our convolution product above to the product of maps $\sigma : V \rightarrow B$ and $\gamma : A \rightarrow B$ given as a map $\gamma * \sigma : V \rightarrow B$ by

$$\gamma * \sigma = \cdot_B(\gamma \otimes \sigma)\rho. \quad (2)$$

Similarly we can define $\beta * \sigma : A \rightarrow \Omega^1(B)$ using now the product of $\Omega^1(B)$ with B rather than $\cdot_B$. Finally, we can define $\beta * \beta$ using in place of $\cdot_B$ the product of $\Omega^1(B)$ with itself to give an element of $\Omega^2(B)$ (this can be done either with a wedge product in the exterior algebra or, more generally, in the differential algebra $\Omega(B)$). With this notation, the formulae for the covariant derivative ∇ corresponding to the gauge potential β and

the curvature $F : A \rightarrow \Omega^2(B)$ read [3]

$$\nabla \sigma = d\sigma + \beta * \sigma \quad (3)$$

$$F = d\beta + \beta * \beta, \quad (4)$$

while the action of gauge transformations on sections and gauge fields, and the resulting transformations of F, ∇ come out as [3]

$$\sigma^\gamma = \gamma * \sigma \quad (5)$$

$$\beta^\gamma = \gamma * \beta * \gamma^{-1} + \gamma * d(\gamma^{-1}) \quad (6)$$

$$\nabla^\gamma = \gamma * \nabla \gamma^{-1} * \quad (7)$$

$$F^\gamma = \gamma * F * \gamma^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover one has the Bianchi identity

$$dF + \beta * F - F * \beta = 0. \quad (9)$$

These local formulae are obtained from the general theory of quantum principal and vector bundles presented in [3]. The gauge potential β corresponds to the local version of the connection 1-form and the connection is defined as an invariant projection on the subspace of the vertical one-forms on the total space of the bundle.

The formulae above simplify further and take more familiar form if we consider A a matrix quantum group [7]. For example, if $A = SL_q(2)$ and $V = \mathbb{C}_q$ (the quantum plane), the formulae appear in matrix form as follows. Write $\gamma^i_j = \gamma(t^i_j)$, $(\gamma^{-1})^i_j = \gamma^{-1}(t^i_j)$, $\beta^i_j = \beta(t^i_j)$, $F^i_j = F(t^i_j)$, and $\sigma^i = \sigma(v^i)$ where t^i_j , $i, j = 1, 2$ are the generators of $SL_q(2)$ and v^i , $i = 1, 2$ are the generators of $\mathbb{C}_q$. Then for example, the transformation of the gauge potential β , the curvature and its transformation come out as

$$(\beta^\gamma)^i_j = \gamma^i_k \beta^k_l (\gamma^{-1})^l_j + \gamma^i_k d(\gamma^{-1})^k_j. \quad (10)$$

$$F^i_j = d\beta^i_j + \beta^i_k \beta^k_j \quad (11)$$

$$F^i_j = \gamma^i_k F^k_l (\gamma^{-1})^l_j. \quad (12)$$

The same formulae work quite generally with A a matrix quantum group [7] and V the Zamolodchikov algebra (for example). Note that each entry γ^i_j is an element of B , so if $B = C(X)$ for a classical space-time X then these entries are functions

$x \rightarrow \gamma^i_j(x)$ as usual. Each value $\gamma^i_j(x)$ is a $\mathbb{C}$ -number. On the other hand, a gauge transformation involves not only $\gamma(t^i_j)$ but the value on all products such as $\gamma^i_j t^k_l = \gamma(t^i_j t^k_l)$ etc. Alternatively, one can work abstractly with the generators t^i_j rather than emphasising any choice of γ . We now specialise to this case $B = C(X)$.

2. In the case when there is a usual space-time X it is also convenient to work with the quantum enveloping algebra H (such as $H = U_q(g)$) dual to A . We now dualise our formulae to this case. Thus a gauge transformation is a suitably invertible map $\gamma : X \rightarrow H$, a gauge field is an element $A \in \Omega^1(X) \otimes H$ etc, where $\Omega^1(X)$ denotes the 1-forms or cotangent space to X . The requirement of convolution invertibility of γ now becomes that at each point $x \in X$, $\gamma(x)$ is an invertible element of H . Given this, the formulae are

$$A^\gamma(x) = \gamma(x)A(x)(\gamma(x))^{-1} + \gamma(x)d(\gamma(x)^{-1}) \quad (13)$$

$$F(x) = dA(x) + A(x) \wedge A(x) \quad (14)$$

$$F^\gamma(x) = \gamma(x)F(x)(\gamma(x))^{-1}. \quad (15)$$

For example, one can write down at once a gauge-invariant Yang-Mills action,

$$L = - \int_X \text{tr}(F \wedge *F) \quad (16)$$

where $*$ denotes the Hodge $*$, as well as all other familiar actions. Note that *we do not use the quantum trace* here since only the ordinary trace is necessarily invariant under conjugation by γ .

Thus, at least in the approach of [3] the quantum-group gauge theory formulae in the case when the base is classical are just analogous to the usual ones.

At first sight one can nevertheless envisage useful applications in which H is a non-standard quantum group, or perhaps a discrete group algebra. There are many non-standard quantum groups (without familiar classical limits) which surely offer here new possibilities for phenomenology. Let us point out however, that this question needs to be approached with care. The reason is that the true gauge group above is not really the quantum group H but the ordinary group H^{inv} of invertible elements of H , for it is here that the gauge transformations take their values.

This situation can be demonstrated in the case $H = U_q(g)$, i.e. q -deformed universal enveloping algebra of Lie algebra g . As an algebra it is known [6] that $U_q(g) \cong U(g)$ the

usual enveloping algebra. Hence the invertible elements of $U_q(g)$ are just the invertible elements of $U(g)$, i.e. the usual group elements $\exp(\xi)$ for $\xi \in g$ (we work here with topological Hopf algebras). Thus the gauge group in this case is just the usual gauge group G with Lie algebra g , viewed in $U_q(g)$ via the isomorphism. In this way, the formulae (13)-(15) are exactly isomorphic to the usual formulae of gauge theory.

This is not to say that there are no differences at all with usual gauge theory, particularly when one considers the matter fields σ . We discuss this at the end of the paper.

3. Our conclusion so far is in marked contrast to claims in the literature [2][14][9][8]. Here we focus on [14][9] and explain some key differences with our approach and some fundamental problems that arise in these works as a result.

We begin by distinguishing carefully between two possibilities for how to generalize the usual transformation of the curvature $F(x) \rightarrow \gamma(x)F(x)(\gamma(x))^{-1}$. If one retains this pointwise conjugation in the quantum case then we are in the situation above, and we must use the classical trace in defining the Yang-Mills action as explained. An alternative, which seems to be the one most relevant to [14][9, eqns (3.13)-(3.14)], is to try to use the quantum adjoint action, in which case one must use the quantum trace (this is specifically designed to be invariant under such a quantum adjoint action). In our present setting where $\gamma(x), F_{\mu\nu} \in U_q(g)$ this second possibility would mean that F transforms as

$$F \rightarrow F^\gamma = \sum \gamma_{(1)} F S \gamma_{(2)} \quad (17)$$

where $\Delta\gamma = \sum \gamma_{(1)} \otimes \gamma_{(2)}$ is the coproduct and S the antipode of the quantum group. The relevant quantum trace now is the category-theoretic trace as used in defining the quantum dimension [10, Section 7.5], namely

$$\underline{\text{tr}}(\) = \text{tr}((\)u), \quad u = \sum (S\mathcal{R}^{(2)})\mathcal{R}^{(1)} \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \sum \mathcal{R}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{(2)}$ is the universal R -matrix and tr is the usual trace. The problem with this approach, as is perhaps well-known, is that there is no way to set up the gauge theory so that F really transforms by the quantum adjoint action. More precisely, one can allow the gauge potential A to transform by $A \rightarrow \sum \gamma_{(1)} A S \gamma_{(2)} + \sum \gamma_{(1)} dS \gamma_{(2)}$ for example, but as far as we know there is no way to define F from this to transform as desired. Note also that products of F etc as in the Yang-Mills action would have to

transform as a module-algebra, i.e. $(FF)^\gamma = \sum F^{\gamma(1)} F^{\gamma(2)}$ for $\int_X dx \underline{\text{tr}} F_{\mu\nu}(x) F^{\mu\nu}(x)$ etc to be invariant.

In summary, we see some *a priori* problems in the attempt to use the quantum trace as claimed in [14][9]. If one wants to use gauge transformations as in (15) then the use of the quantum trace (discussed by [14][9] in a dual language) rather than the usual trace, renders the action non-invariant. If on the other hand one tries to use some kind of quantum adjoint action like (17) then it seems unlikely that there is a formulation of transformation of gauge fields leading to the desired transformation of the curvature.

Finally, we consider the situation explicitly in the matrix form that is proposed in [9, eqns (3.13)-(3.14)]. We show that the $GL_q(2)$ invariant Yang-Mills lagrangian proposed there based on the matrix quantum trace is not gauge invariant if we compose two (or more) transformations. The same applies to a similar proposal in [14] for $SU_q(2)$. In both cases one uses the well-known quantum trace of a 2×2 matrix E as

$$\text{tr}_q E = q^{-1} E_{11} + q E_{22}. \quad (19)$$

If $G_{ij} \in GL_q(2)$ is a matrix of generators then the transformation

$$E \rightarrow E' = G E S G \quad (20)$$

leaves $\text{tr}_q E$ invariant provided $[E_{ij}, G_{kl}] = 0$, for all $i, j, k, l = 1, 2$. This definition is used to the construction of the invariant lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_q = \text{tr}_q(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) \quad (21)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu}$ are components of the gauge-field strength. This lagrangian is indeed invariant under the transformation

$$F_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow F'_{\mu\nu} = G F_{\mu\nu} S G = F_{\mu\nu}^I \otimes G \sigma^I S G; \quad [F_{\mu\nu}^I, G_{ij}] = 0 \quad (22)$$

where σ^I are the identity matrix for σ^0 and the Pauli matrices for $\sigma^1, \sigma^2, \sigma^3$. Of course, we can equally well work with $F_{\mu\nu ij} = F_{\mu\nu}^I (\sigma^I)_{ij}$, which is the notation used in [14, Section IV]. The idea is that it transforms like the E_{ij} above. It does not matter here exactly what kind of object the components $F_{\mu\nu}^I$ or $F_{\mu\nu ij}$ are as long as they all commute with all the G_{ij} , in which case the defining property of the quantum trace ensures that

$$\text{tr}_q(F_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}) = \text{tr}_q(F'_{\mu\nu} F'_{\mu\nu}). \quad (23)$$

Unfortunately, we cannot in general repeat this gauge transformation because the matrix entries of the transformed $F'_{\mu\nu}$ need not similarly commute with the G_{ij} . For example, even if $F_{\mu\nu}$ is a classical $\mathbb{C}$ -matrix (so that its matrix entries commute with the G_{ij}), the transformed field strength $F'_{\mu\nu}$ involves G, SG and hence need not commute.

Another way to see this is that if we do go ahead and repeat the gauge transformation, i.e. consider

$$F'_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow F''_{\mu\nu} = G^2 F'_{\mu\nu} (SG^2) \quad (24)$$

we see immediately that

$$\mathrm{tr}_q(F''_{\mu\nu} F''_{\mu\nu}) \neq \mathrm{tr}_q(F_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}) \quad (25)$$

if $q \neq 1$. This is because [5][13] the matrix $G' = G^2$ obeys the relations of the quantum group $GL_{q^2}(2)$. Therefore the trace tr_q has to be replaced by tr_{q^2} to keep the lagrangian invariant. Hence this matrix version of quantum group gauge theory also fails. We note in passing that our analysis does however, raise the interesting possibility of restoring a kind of gauge symmetry *if we transform the q also*, raising it to a power with each gauge transformation. Another way out, which may be related to the recent preprint [8], is on each transformation to use for G the generators of another independent commuting copy of $GL_q(2)$. Such an approach does not, however, resemble any usual kind of gauge theory.

This problem with the Yang-Mills action based on a quantum trace applies to both [14] and [9]. Even if we can solve this (perhaps by transforming q) we are still left with the problem of justifying the desired transformation (22) in terms for the transformation of an underlying gauge potential A_μ . This does not seem likely. For example, it is attempted in [14, Section III] and the following problem arises: each matrix component $A_{ij} = dx^\mu A_{\mu ij}$ is a one-form on X , yet the transformation law proposed in [14, eqn. (20)] is

$$A'_{ij} = A_{kl} \otimes (Su_{ik})u_{lj} + 1 \otimes (Su_{ik})du_{kj} \quad (26)$$

where the quantum group matrix generators are denoted u_{ij} rather than G_{ij} or t^i_j . The first part is the quantum adjoint action just as in (22) written in a different way. Unfortunately, the d in the second part *is not* the space-time d but the bicovariant differential d on the quantum gauge group. It seems hard to interpret this then as some kind of gauge theory unless we identify the base and the quantum gauge group, which is not possible in the setting of [14] where the base is assumed classical (its ring of functions

$C(X)$ is commutative).

We see here the need for a fundamental ingredient in our quantum group gauge theory of Section 2, namely in our gauge field transformation law (6),(10) the gauge transformation maps $\gamma, \gamma^{-1} : A \rightarrow B$ take us from the quantum group A to $B = C(X)$ so that the d in our $\gamma * d(\gamma^{-1})$ or $\gamma^i_k d(\gamma^{-1})^k_j$ is truly the space-time differential as it should be. This is also the role played in usual gauge theory by the gauge transformation. It should be stressed also that in our formalism we do not require $\gamma : A \rightarrow B$ to be an algebra map as this would surely be too restrictive when A is quantum and $B = C(X)$ is classical.

4. To conclude our discussion, we can summarise the situation as follows: we have obtained a working quantum group gauge theory on classical spaces as a limit of the general theory in [3], which differs from [14][9] and avoids problems present there. On the other hand, the formulae for the gauge fields themselves in our approach (as obtained in Section 2) do not make explicit use of the coalgebra structure Δ . Yet it is only here that the difference between $U_q(g)$ and $U(g)$ truly exists. Thus the gauge group is a standard one. Moreover, even for non-standard quantum groups H , the effective gauge group is a classical one in this limit of [3].

Let us note that this quantum group gauge theory on classical spacetime can nevertheless differ in more subtle ways from the usual one, when one considers matter fields. If we describe these in our original form in Section 1 as maps $\sigma : V \rightarrow C(X)$ while working with $A_\mu(x), \gamma(x) \in H$ as in Section 2, the corresponding formulae are as follows. Here H is a quantum enveloping algebra such as $U_q(g)$ and V can be any algebra covariant under the quantum group H in the sense that it is a right H -module algebra[10, Sec. 6]. It means that the product of V is covariant under an action $\triangleleft$ (from the right) of H in the sense

$$(vw)\triangleleft h = \sum (v\triangleleft h_{(1)})(w\triangleleft h_{(2)}), \quad 1\triangleleft h = 1\epsilon(h) \quad \forall h \in H. \quad (27)$$

Thus, which algebras are covariant in this way does depend on Δ and so does detect the difference between $U_q(g)$ and $U(g)$. Since the coproduct of $U_q(g)$ is not cocommutative, it tends to require that V is not commutative, i.e. not really the algebra of functions on any actual vector space.

For example, if V is the Zamolodchikov algebra with generators v^i as in Section 1,

then a section σ is equivalent to specifying the $\mathbb{C}$ -number fields

$$\sigma^{i_1 \cdots i_n}(x) = \sigma(v^{i_1} \cdots v^{i_n})(x); \quad n = 1, 2, \cdots \quad (28)$$

Since H acts from the right on the generators of V , it acts from the left on these fields. Indeed, the transformation law (2) in Section 1 now reduces to the assertion that these fields $\sigma^{i_1 \cdots i_n}(x)$ transform in tensor products of the fundamental matrix representation ρ of $U_q(g)$ dual to $A(R)$,

$$(\sigma^\gamma)^{i_1 \cdots i_n}(x) = \langle \gamma(x), t^{i_1}_{j_1} \cdots t^{i_n}_{j_n} \rangle \sigma^{j_1 \cdots j_n}(x) = \rho^{\otimes n}(\gamma(x))^{i_1 \cdots i_n}_{j_1 \cdots j_n} \sigma^{j_1 \cdots j_n}(x). \quad (29)$$

Likewise, the covariant derivative comes out as $\nabla = d + \rho^{\otimes n}(A)$ as usual. We consider all the fields together (for all n) because this is equivalent to working with the entire (infinite-dimensional) quantum algebra V . Of course, one can specialise to individual submodules such as σ^i in the fundamental quantum group representation.

We can also describe the matter fields equivalently in the dualised way as in Section 2. We continue with $A_\mu(x), \gamma(x) \in H$ as there. Thus $\sigma(x) \in C$ where $C = V^*$ in terms of Section 1. Such C are required in our formalism to be left H -module coalgebras[10, Sec. 6]. Explicitly, it means they are linear spaces equipped with a coalgebra $\Delta_C : C \rightarrow C \otimes C$, $\epsilon_C : C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is covariant under an action $\triangleright$ of H in the sense

$$(h_{(1)} \triangleright \otimes h_{(2)} \triangleright) \Delta_C c = \Delta_C(h \triangleright c), \quad \epsilon_C(h \triangleright c) = \epsilon(h) \epsilon_C(c), \quad \forall h \in H, c \in C. \quad (30)$$

This is equivalent to the description with V but in a different notation. The covariant derivative and gauge transformations in this language are simply

$$\sigma^\gamma(x) = \gamma(x) \triangleright \sigma(x), \quad \nabla \sigma(x) = d\sigma(x) + A(x) \triangleright \sigma(x). \quad (31)$$

For example, we can take here $C = H$ (as a coalgebra with $\Delta_C = \Delta$) and $\triangleright$ the left action by multiplication. Thus, $\sigma(x), \gamma(x), A_\mu(x) \in H$ and $\nabla = d + A$ where $A_\mu(x)$ acts by multiplication from the left in H . Likewise, $\sigma^\gamma(x) = \gamma(x)\sigma(x)$.

For another example, we can take $C = \underline{H}$ the braided group associated to H [11] when H is a true quantum group (with universal R-matrix), and we take for $\triangleright$ the quantum adjoint action. Here $\underline{H}$ has the same algebra as H but its comultiplication $\Delta_C = \underline{\Delta}$ is not the usual one, being instead modified in just such a way as to be covariant under the quantum adjoint action[11]. Thus, $\sigma(x) \in \underline{H}$ and its transformation law is

$$\sigma^\gamma(x) = \sum \gamma(x)_{(1)} \sigma(x) S\gamma(x)_{(2)}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, in our quantum group gauge theory a particle σ in such a quantum adjoint representation transforms differently from the gauge field and curvature (the latter transform by point-wise conjugation as we have seen in Section 2). These two types of adjoint action are the same in the classical case of $H = U(g)$ but become distinct in the quantum case. It means that gauge fields are not the same thing as adjoint-covector fields in our picture for algebraic reasons, in addition to the familiar geometrical differences between gauge fields and covectors fields. Note that there is no trouble writing down covariant equations of motion for any matter fields σ , such as

$$\nabla^\mu \nabla_\mu \sigma = 0 \tag{33}$$

since ∇ in (31) is covariant. On the other hand, finding a corresponding lagrangian, as well as lagrangians for sigma-models, appears to be more problematic. In the case of the quantum adjoint representation (32) we have of course at our disposal the invariant quantum trace (18) as well a covariant product and a covariant coproduct $\underline{\Delta}$.

There are plenty of other possibilities for comodule algebras C in which the matter fields can take their values (such as the coadjoint action on $C = A(R)$). In all these cases we see that the formulae as in (31) are fairly analogous to the usual formulae, with the field $\sigma(x)$ transforming in a representation $\triangleright$ of the quantum group. The difference between $U_q(g)$ and $U(g)$ shows up in the allowed coalgebra structure on C . In fact, this is not so important in the first approximation, in the same way as the algebra structure on V in Section 1 does not enter directly into the transformation formulae. It is, however, needed for a correct quantum-geometrical interpretation in the general theory[3] (where V is a quantum vector space). Of the same status are normalization conditions corresponding to those mentioned in Section 1, which become now $\epsilon(\gamma(x)) = 1$, $\epsilon(A_\mu(x)) = 0$ and $\epsilon_C(\sigma(x)) = 1$. Again, they are not too essential but are needed for the correct interpretation in [3]. For example, the last of these says that σ in (32) should be thought of as like a group-valued field, while $\sigma - 1$ is more like a Lie-algebra valued field. One can also use the normalization $\epsilon_C(\sigma(x)) = \lambda$ where λ is a constant (which could be zero) and thereby cover both cases.

A further place in this picture where the deformation of the comultiplication plays a significant role is in the non-commutativity of tensor product of representations. Thus, while the representations of $U_q(g)$ coincide with those of $U(g)$, their tensor products coincide only up to a non-trivial isomorphism. Moreover, if V and W are two spaces of

the representation of $U_q(g)$, $V \otimes W$ and $W \otimes V$ are not related in the usual way but by a non-trivial braiding Ψ . Likewise for the braided tensor product[11] of quantum vector spaces in Section 1 or of the module coalgebras above. Thus one may expect then that the effects of q -deforming the gauge group (with the space-time classical) will show up quite generally when one considers the interaction between different fields, in the form of braid statistics. These are topics for further work.

References

- [1] E. Abe. *Hopf Algebras*. Cambridge, 1980.
- [2] I.Ya. Aref'eva, I.V. Volovich. Quantum group gauge fields. *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* 6(10):893-907, 1991.
- [3] T. Brzeziński and S. Majid. Quantum group gauge theory on quantum spaces. *Preprint DAMTP/92-27*, 1992.
- [4] T. Brzeziński and S. Majid. A class of bicovariant differential calculi on Hopf algebras. *Preprint DAMTP/92-33*, 1992.
- [5] E. Corrigan, D.B. Fairlie, P. Fletcher and R. Sasaki. Some aspects of quantum groups and supergroups. *J. Math. Phys.* 31:776-780, 1990.
- [6] V.G. Drinfeld. Quasihopf algebras. *Leningrad Math. J.* 1:1419, 1990.
- [7] L.D. Fadeev, N.Yu. Reshetikhin, and L.A. Takhtajan. Quantization of Lie groups and Lie algebras. *Algebra i Analiz*, 1, 1989.
- [8] M. Hirayama. Yang-Mills theory of quantum groups. *Toyama University preprint*, 1992.
- [9] A.P. Isaev, Z. Popowicz. q -Trace for quantum groups and q -deformed Yang-Mills theory. *Phys. Lett.*, 281, 271-278, 1992.
- [10] S. Majid. Quasitriangular Hopf algebras and Yang-Baxter equations. *Int. J. Modern Physics A* 5(1):1-91, 1990.
- [11] S. Majid. Braided groups and algebraic quantum field theories. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 22:167-175, 1991.

- [12] M.E. Sweedler. *Hopf algebras*. Benjamin, 1969.
- [13] S. Vokos, B. Zumino and J. Wess. Properties of 2×2 quantum matrices, preprint, 1989.
- [14] K. Wu, R.-J. Zhang. Algebraic approach to gauge theory in non-commutative extension. *Commun. Theor. Phys.* 17:175-182, 1992.